DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 031 794 EA 002 435

By-Taylor, H. Ralph

The Educational Dimensions of the Model Cities Program.

Pub Date 69

Note-20p.; Chapter 2 in EDUCATION AND URBAN RENAISSANCE, Edited by Roald F. Campbell, & Others. Book based on papers presented at Natl. Conf. on Educ. Dimension of Model Cities Prog. (Univ. of Chicago Ctr. for Continuing Educ.).

Available from-John Wiley & Sons, Inc., 605 Third Avenue, New York, N.Y. 10016 ($5.95).

EDRS Price MF-$0.25 HC-$1.10

Descriptors-Action Programs (Community), City Planning, *City Problems, *Demonstration Programs, Educationally Disadvantaged, *Interagency Coordination, Racial Integration, *School Role, *Urban Slums

Identifiers-*Model Cities Program

Educational policy of the future must place the role of education within the broad context of societal goals. The urban slum condition will not be eliminated by individual programs which focus on special problem areas viewed in relative isolation. The Model Cities Program is a unified approach. First, neighborhoods are asked to fully analyze their problems. Then they must develop a set of approaches, priorities, and goals that constitute their response to local conditions. Finally, the neighborhoods must create an administrative structure that will pull together the various elements in the community to attack problems in their full breadth. Recognition should also be given to the fact that education is not competent to move into areas which are not directly educational. However, cooperation among all of the community's institutions is needed to solve basic problems. The schools must learn to work not only with other elements of local government, but also with the larger community in order to enhance their key role. A question and answer session follows this discussion. (DE)

EDUCATION AND URBAN RENAISSANCE

This book is based on papers presented
at the
National Conference on the Educational
Dimension of the Model Cities Program
held at
The University of Chicago
Center for Continuing Education

Edited by
ROALD F. CAMPBELL
LUCY ANN MARX
RAPHAEL O. NYSTRAND

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

JOHN WILEY & SONS, INC.
New York London Sydney Toronto

EA002435

$5.95

1/11/71 ✓
✓

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS COPYRIGHTED MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY J. S. Barnes, Jr.

TO ERIC AND ORGANIZATIONS OPERATING UNDER AGREEMENTS WITH THE U.S. OFFICE OF EDUCATION. FURTHER REPRODUCTION OUTSIDE THE ERIC SYSTEM REQUIRES PERMISSION OF THE COPYRIGHT OWNER."

Copyright © 1969 by John Wiley & Sons, Inc.

All rights reserved. No part of this book may be reproduced by any means, nor transmitted, nor translated into a machine language without the written permission of the publisher.

Library of Congress Catalog Card Number: 68-56160
SBN 471 13250 0
Printed in the United States of America

CONTRIBUTING AUTHORS

STEPHEN K. BAILEY

DONALD BOURGEOIS

PAUL W. BRIGGS

WILLARD J. CONGREVE

LUVERN L. CUNNINGHAM

JOHN H. FISCHER

MORRIS JANOWITZ

DAVID LEWIS

HYLAN LEWIS

JOSEPH J. SCHWAB

H. RALPH TAYLOR

FOREWORD

During the past decade many individuals and institutions have become increasingly concerned with the magnitude of urban educational problems. Located in the midst of an urban renewal area, The University of Chicago has been one of these institutions. Recently, a university planning committee decided to provide a national forum for considering these problems. The central question to be discussed by this forum was: *What are the characteristics of an ideal urban school?*

While the planning committee was in its early stages of deliberation, Congress passed the *Demonstration Cities and Metropolitan Development Act of 1966* (Public Law 89-754), commonly referred to as the Model Cities legislation. It occurred to the planning committee that in calling for educational components in Model City areas, this legislation was encouraging the establishment of ideal urban schools. Sensing some unity of purpose with this legislation and believing that it provides a unique opportunity to affect the course of urban education, the committee decided to hold a conference that would direct attention to "Educational Dimensions of the Model Cities Program." Participants at this conference included school and local government officials from major cities, representatives of community organizations and agencies, and university scholars.* The conference was supported, in part, by Science Research Associates, The Sears Foundation, and The Wieboldt Foundation.

Title I of Public Law 89-754 encourages the establishment of Model Cities (or, in more recent terminology, "model neighborhoods") by offering financial and technical assistance to cities:

> . . . to plan, develop, and carry out locally prepared and scheduled comprehensive city demonstration programs containing new and imaginative proposals to rebuilt or revitalize large slum and blighted areas; to expand housing, job, and income opportunities; to reduce dependence on welfare payments; *to improve educational facilities and programs,* [emphases added]; to combat disease and ill health; to reduce the incidence of crime and to establish better access between home and jobs; and generally to improve living conditions for the people who live in such areas, and to accomplish these objectives through the most effective and economical concentration and coordination of Federal, State, and local public and private efforts to improve the quality of urban life.

*Appendix A contains a list of conference participants.

Title II of the law also has importance for educators:

> It is the purpose of this title to provide, through greater coordination of Federal programs and through supplementary grants for certain federally assisted development projects, additional encouragement and assistance to States and localities for making comprehensive metropolitan planning and programming effective.

Thus the act offers incentives to educators and other local officials who wish to establish "ideal" urban schools and / or who are willing to consider urban educational problems on a metropolitan basis.

Our committee was impressed by the comprehensive approach called for in this legislation, for many previous efforts to treat urban educational problems have been characterized by a fragmented and incremental approach. At the federal level, for example, the Office of Education, the Office of Economic Opportunity, and the Department of Labor have developed independent job training programs. Few attempts have been made to develop a coordinated approach to the totality of educational problems that confront a particular city. Perhaps more important, previous efforts have been essentially attempts to add this or that to existing programs. Potential reformers have been forced to work within the strictures imposed by existing social contexts and the traditional operating patterns of established institutions. One could reasonably ask whether the history of efforts to improve urban education might reflect more success if the disadvantages of fragmented and incremental approaches could have been avoided.

It would appear that, as conceived by Congress, Public Law 89-754 offers cities the opportunity to overcome these disadvantages in planning educational components for Model City demonstration projects. The act provides a mandate to create new urban environments and, as an essential part thereof, to develop coordinated educational programs within new contexts. It marks the first time that legislation concerned with urban development makes specific reference to schools, boards of education, and their need to relate to mutually reinforcing institutional sectors of society. For the first time, there is opportunity for a community to design and perfect totally new institutions and institutional arrangements to satisfy societal needs.

Acknowledging the opportunities present in the Model Cities legislation, there is still room for apprehension about the way in which it will be implemented. There is the possibility, for example, that certain portions of the law or the program guidelines relating to it may be inappropriate in some respect. There is the further possibility that, in developing Model City plans, opportunities to improve educational programs will not be recognized as clearly or treated as seriously by city officials as will simultaneous opportunities to improve housing

and other physical characteristics of the community. Moreover, there is danger that, in planning educational components, those responsible will not think "big" enough, thereby replicating the incremental errors of the planners who preceded them.

We held our conference at a time too early to assess the impact of the Model Cities legislation or even to evaluate the efforts of those cities that submitted proposals for a Model City demonstration to the Department of Housing and Urban Development. We hope that we held the conference early enough to call attention to the educational possibilities inherent in the act, to identify potential weaknesses in the legislation, and to give some assistance to individuals charged with developing city programs. We further hope that, whatever the ultimate outcome of the Model Cities Program, the ideas presented at this conference will be useful to persons interested in the question, "What are the characteristics of an ideal urban school?" We would emphasize that the significance of this question transcends the fate of any particular piece of legislation. With or without the Model Cities legislations the problems dealt with here must be faced by the cities and the nation.

The first chapter describes educational problems in the urban setting. Chapters 2 through 12 contain the papers presented by conference participants. In some cases, these papers were followed by questions and answers from the floor. An example of these exchanges is included in Chapter 2, to which it pertains. Considerable time at the conference was devoted to small group discussions. Chapter 13 summarizes the themes that emerged from those sessions and blends them with our perspectives in a concluding statement and a set of recommendations regarding urban schools of the future.

Chicago, Illinois
Columbus, Ohio
September 1968

Roald F. Campbell
Lucy Ann Marx
Raphael O. Nystrand

CONTENTS

	1	Educational Problems in the Urban Setting EA002434	1
Part I		**The Model Cities Program: An Approach to the Problems of Urban Education**	**13**
	2	Educational Dimensions of the Model Cities Program *H. Ralph Taylor*	15
	3	Educational Problems and the Model Cities Program *Paul W. Briggs*	29
Part II		**Serving Urban Clients**	**35**
	4	Integration and Disintegration of Education *Joseph J. Schwab*	37
	5	Who Shall Be Served? *Hylan Lewis*	45
	6	Humanizing Teaching *Willard J. Congreve*	53

ED031794

2

THE EDUCATIONAL DIMENSIONS OF THE MODEL CITIES PROGRAM

H. RALPH TAYLOR*

It would be foolhardy, indeed, for me to speak about education in the technical sense. I am an educational layman, and I know my limitations in this area. On the other hand, education is a servant of a society that is under lay leadership and lay control, and, as a layman, I have an interest and an obligation to discuss issues of educational policy. The relationship between the school and the society is too important for education to be left to schoolmen alone—just as the highway and the fabric of the city are too interrelated for the highway engineer to be the final arbiter of highway location and design.

The problems of educational policy must be viewed within the broad context of the kind of society that we have set as our objective. It is a truism that education both shapes such a society and, in turn, is shaped by it. We must also look at the problems within the context of the special needs and circumstances of particular cities. Given the existing range and variety of conditions, I suggest that there is no one formula, no one magic elixir, no one all-purpose panacea for determining educational policies. In the urban arena especially, I am very skeptical of the easy or all-embracing answer.

EA 002 435

*H. Ralph Taylor is Assistant Secretary for Demonstrations and Inter-Governmental Relations in the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development.

As a layman, I propose to discuss (1) the slum problem and (2) the Model Cities approach to the problem and the role of the educational institution in this program. The slum is not a building, inadequate though the building may be. A slum is a *condition*, not a structure. The slum is a condition in which:

People are poor because they lack the income to do more than struggle for survival.
Housing is poor because it is old and worn out and there is no incentive for private investment for improvement and because slum neighborhoods have been neglected in the basics of city housekeeping and other services.
Public and private facilities are inadequate. These facilities, the infrastructure of a neighborhood, are inefficient or, in many cases, lacking altogether. It is ironic, for example, that the poor do not have access to that great American institution, the supermarket, with its sizable economies in mass purchasing and modern merchandising techniques.
Security is poor because some poor people, in their fight for survival, resort to a strategy of violence—most often against the people in their own or similar neighborhoods. Traditional police methods cannot assure security when the causes for lack of security are rooted deep in the basic environment.
Education is poor because in too many communities, especially ghettos, the schools have deteriorated, the quality of teaching does not match the need, and the educational policies and methods are too inflexible.

Much more could be said, but I think I have made my major point: the slum condition is so complex that it will not be solved by any single program —federal, state, or other—nor by the release of a flood of dollars alone. It can be solved only by a partnership that involves all levels of government and private efforts and relies heavily on local capability and local willingness to face reality. This partnership must institute and direct a process of institutional and social change in an attack upon the basic factors responsible for slum creation.

The objective must be to build institutions that meet the real needs of the poor realistically and effectively. They must be institutions that will improve the competence and independence of the poor to take hold of opportunities for better health, education, housing, and employment that have been denied in the past and must be opened in the future.

The urban slum is not a new phenomenon. I suspect very strongly that the Roman "bread and circus" was originally a summer antiriot measure. Certainly, conditions today in our worst slums are better than those in the London portrayed by Hogarth or Dickens or those in New York described by Riis. However, something new *has* been added—a drastic rise in the aspirations of society and the realization that it has the power to achieve those

aspirations.

We now know that the slum can be destroyed and that the resources of men and technology that have created space vehicles and atomic-powered submarines can also create a decent society for all. Hence we tend to be less patient with any conditions that are not inevitable. The people who live in slum areas are especially prone to impatience and generate the creative tension that maintains pressure for forward motion. Public policy has been concerned with the problem of the slum for many years and in many ways. Public housing, for example, was started in the mid-1930's on the assumption that the provision of decent, safe and sanitary housing in sufficient volume will eliminate slums. The renewal program of the 1949 Housing Act was a lineal descendant of this emphasis on the brick-and-mortar approach to the elimination of decay. Many other programs have developed over time, in the areas of health, welfare, job training, and education, among others.

All of these programs focused on their own special area. Whether their administration involved a direct federal-city government relationship or whether they operated through a state agency and a state functional plan, their operating principle remained the same. They focused on a special problem area, viewed in relative isolation. There has been no mechanism for pulling together these efforts at any level of government—federal, state, or local.

There have been bits and pieces of effort at coordination here and there. For example, the Office of Economic Opportunity established local Community Action Agencies to mesh some of the programs that relate to the poor. These agencies have had some success, but activities in major areas still remain fragmented and separate. The approach seems to have been to try to bring within one program diverse umbrella activities that are only marginally related, such as family and social welfare and education, rather than to work out a true marriage or partnership between programs. Somehow it has seemed easier to set up competing institutions than to make existing institutions work together more effectively.

For example, I have listened to conversations of school people in which the following proposition was advanced with the best of motives: The educational function of the school system cannot be carried out when kids are hungry and inadequately clothed and their families are hostile because of environmental conditions. Accordingly, to meet its educational responsibility, the school system should assume responsibility for food, clothing, and the larger community welfare problem.

When asked what I think of this proposition, my response covers two major points. First, the recognition of the interdependence of education and the societal framework is essential to progress. Second, the school as an institution is not competent to move into the areas of special programs to solve problems that are not directly educational. The real challenge is to meld

together an effective working coalition at the local level of the institutions and agencies that have competence in these areas. This coalition must develop the flexibility and adaptivity to change required to meet needs as they exist, not as they are seen from the narrow "viewports" out of which prisoners of rigid institutional structures get their glimpses of reality.

I am not taking special aim at the educational establishment. I think other establishments are equally guilty. Each seems to lack faith in the other. The proposed solutions seem to focus on one of the following, depending on the institution speaking: bring welfare services into the neighborhood; find jobs for the hard-core unemployed; provide more low-priced housing; create a positive state of health; let the citizens learn by planning and working.

I suggest that the answer is not any one of these, but all of them and more, and that is what the Model Cities Program is all about. This program is based on a very simple concept—deceptively simple in its challenge. The program says that a community should pull together its resources to make a lasting impact on the basic problems of a large slum neighborhood. We asked the 194 cities that prepared and filed applications in a three-month period to do the following:

1. Analyze the problems in a neighborhood, which in larger cities could include as much as 10 per cent of the population. Note our use of the verb *analyze*—not simply describe. We want the participating cities to understand the causal factors—the elements in the social, economic, and educational complex that work to maintain current conditions. If the cities do not understand the why of conditions, they will not be able to make the changes necessary to correct them.
2. Develop a set of approaches, of priorities and goals, that constitute their response to local conditions.
3. Describe the administrative structure that will pull together the various elements in the community, so that the problem can be approached in its full breadth.

In illustrating this requirement for administrative structure, I have generally cited the case of the independent school board. Obviously, we are not going to require a change in the formal relationship between the school board and the rest of local government. This is neither our responsibility nor within our power to accomplish. Equally obvious is the fact that the cooperative participation of the educational system is an absolute essential for the rejuvenation or rehabilitation of a neighborhood and its people. Accordingly, we have asked for evidence that the school system is involved in the problem analysis and the goal setting, and has a role to play in the planning and administration of the program that will give the city and the federal government some assurance that the necessary quality and intensity of effort will be

forthcoming.

The Model Cities Program is really a "demonstration neighborhood" program insofar as middle-sized and larger cities are concerned. It is a test, a demonstration to determine whether the concentration of resources and effort can build a bridge between problem and solution. A bridge-building process has to choose between components, just as a child making a bridge with an erector set chooses between pieces. Priorities have to be worked out, relationships and linkages developed, targets established, and procedures for evaluation of progress set up.

This has to be done at the community level, where the approach must be as broad as the problem. Schools have a key role in education and training, in motivation, and in the development of a sense of the dignity of the individual. In many cities the educational system must do much more than it is now doing, and in a Model Cities Program it must do so in partnership with other elements of the urban structure, public and private, that are or should be working toward the same broad objectives. The school system must believe in its broad role and must learn to work not only with other elements of local government, but also with the larger community, particularly with the residents of the area. There are many explosive issues to be faced, such as those raised in the Coleman Report[1] as to whether any improvement is possible, given the existence of socioeconomic segregation.

I expect that local communities will develop a variety of approaches, responsive to the varieties of local conditions, including differences in local political courage and local willingness to try the politically difficult solution. We want to test a variety of answers. After all, this is a demonstration program. But all of the approaches to be tested should hold promise of improvement in the quality of education. The school as an institution for custodial care, which is the pattern in some slum neighborhoods today, is not an answer that we care to demonstrate.

Let me, as I conclude, raise directly, rather than wait for questions, the issue of racial integration. I believe very strongly that compulsory segregation is morally indefensible. The President has stated the administration's position:

> This Administration has pledged that as long as racial discrimination denies opportunity and equal rights in America, we will honor our constitutional and moral responsibility to restore the balance of justice.[2]

[1]James Coleman et al., *Equality of Educational Opportunity*, U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare Office of Education (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1966), 737 pp.

[2]President Johnson's Message to the Congress on Civil Rights, April 28, 1966, page 10, paragraph 10.

But he has also made it clear that "We shall need years of trial and error before the results of what we have done so far can be seen."[3] This does not mean, of course, that it is better to do nothing until we can do it all. I also agree with Whitney Young's recent statement:

> It is essential to realize that the debate now raging over whether to disperse the ghetto or to rebuild it is a debate without substance. Housing stock in the ghetto must be redeemed or replaced no matter who lives there—this year or next. The schools in the ghetto must be made excellent no matter who attends them—this year or next. And neither can wait on solutions to other problems before the beginnings are made there.[4]

We in the executive branch of government can administer programs only within the framework of the legislative history and statutory language that sets parameters on our flexibility. We cannot use the Model Cities Program as a tool to compel that which the Congress has refused to authorize. This program is not a tool to *compel* open housing, or city- or county-wide open occupancy ordinances. However, this does not mean that the program will not result in substantial change in the quality of life and the opportunity for progress of people now trapped in that euphemism for tragedy, a "deprived area."

We hope and expect that as local community leadership analyzes clearly and coldly the core problems of its slum neighborhood and its people, the recognition of causal factors will lead to a willingness to innovate, to experiment, to bring the wider community along on actions that would cause deep resentment were they ordered from Washington. There are no comparable constraints of legislative history standing in the path of what the local community wants to accomplish. I am hopeful, indeed, that as you and your schools participate in the local problem-solving partnership, you will have the flexibility and the imagination to develop and test new ways of educating, motivating, and relating to the community, new patterns of utilizing personnel and resources, and new relationships between school and people.

The Model Cities Program provides an opportunity to experiment, to test, and to evaluate under circumstances where the school is a partner in a large effort. I hope that you will welcome and use that opportunity to the benefit of the people for whom the school system must remain the great ladder upward into society.

[3]President Johnson's Message to the Congress on Civil Rights, February 15, 1967, page 6, paragraph 8.

[4]Senate Sub-Committee on Executive Re-Organization of the Committee on Government Operations, Abraham Ribicoff, Chairman. December 14, 1966. Washington, D.C.

Discussion Following Mr. Taylor's Remarks

Question. How can the Model Cities Program help destroy slums and achieve racial integration, so long as a community restricts its activity to the area of the Model Cities geographic designation?

Mr. Taylor. There's no need for the community to restrict its vision to that area. I did not say *we* were going to use this program in quite the way you did —I said we would be happy if *you* did, and that makes a big political difference. There is no requirement that communities restrict their vision to the Model City universe, the target neighborhoods. It would be much simpler, both for our administration of the program and for the mayor, not to have to make the hard choice that says: these poor people on one side of the street benefit and these poor people on the other side are beyond our guidelines. That's a brutal kind of choice, and I wish we didn't have to make it, but unless the program is to sink down into a light coating of cosmetic powder, there must be concentration of effort and resources. As the efforts and resources are concentrated on the problem, some things can be done outside the target neighborhood without losing relationship to the program. For example, if Model Cities supplemental funds are used to provide seed money for nonprofit housing corporations, there is no need for those corporations to be operating exclusively within the area. They are a relocation resource. In fact, we'd be delighted to have them outside the target neighborhood.

Question. You stated that segregation was morally indefensible, and we understand that to be official policy of the Department of Housing and Urban Development, but then you say that certain actions, if ordered by Washington, would cause deep resentment across the country. Are these two positions in agreement?

Mr. Taylor. Yes, I've had correspondence that reflects your question, but we live in a world that is real. The constraints in the legislative history on this program are very specific. There was language in the bill as introduced that would have made this an aggressive instrumentality for integration. That language was specifically deleted as the Senate worked on the bill, and there is reference to that deletion in the Congressional debates. Then there was one debate that resulted in a proposed amendment that would have forbidden a local community to bus students. It was replaced by an amendment that forbids us to require busing, but does allow us to help you if you choose to bus. I am focusing on busing not because it was on our mind (I have many doubts as to its validity), but to illustrate the context of the legislation.

We have to operate within the legislative framework. On the other hand, we

are saying that there's nothing to prevent you from doing anything your community will support. We think it's both a little naïve and a little unreal, and perhaps a little unfair, for the community to be unwilling to do something and then come to us and say, "Make us do it, we know we ought to be doing it." This is essentially the kind of position that some communities have been taking.

Question. How will you reconcile the realism that you say your agency has with your stated desire to really examine these local programs carefully, so that most of them achieve the maximum innovations?

Mr. Taylor. There seems to be an assumption that the only thing worth doing is dispersing children to achieve school integration. I hope I'm not overstating that position. I say that there are many things that need to be tried. In the final analysis, regardless of what the legislation is, running to a federal agency and saying, "You put the heat on us," is an escape from the very heart of the job that you must do locally. That job is to understand your problems and help your community to see the implication of the conditions they are maintaining. We'll help them to understand as much as we can. We'll look at your proposals. We'll look at what you can do in terms of quality. The one thing we can't do is to take the doctrinaire position that the only road to quality in a ghetto school is to bus or to disperse. We can't take that position, but we will push you, as hard as our staff resources and capabilities will permit us, to do the job that your staff resources and capabilities and the constraints of your situation will allow.

Question. I have a strong suspicion that we're actually going to perpetuate the ghetto. Will we perpetuate the segregation of schools, which, if I understood correctly what you said earlier in your comments on the Coleman Report, is directly contrary to what we perhaps believe is best for children?

Mr. Taylor. I'm not enough of a social scientist to know whether the Coleman Report is or isn't valid. I am in strong disagreement with the position that says, "There is only one road to salvation." We ought to be pushing on every available front to improve the schools in the ghetto substantially more than we improve them in the rest of the community. We ought to be trying to improve the competence, the economic standards, and the skills of the people there, so that the passage of an open occupancy ordinance is a meaningful thing for many people rather than an escape for a few. We ought to be moving on all fronts simultaneously, but we cannot expect a tool that is designed as

an approach to one front to be twisted to handle all others.

Question. I have a feeling that the schools are being used today to do all the things that can't be done any other way. But may I raise another problem: I discovered in my home state that the only cities that are applying for Model Cities funds are those that are strong in the area of planning and have considerable experience and a long history of working in this area. If this is the case, Model Cities funds may only serve to make the rich richer. Does that seem to follow?

Mr. Taylor. We tried to structure this program so that cities do not need consultants. We did get 75 or 80 communities with populations of less than 50,000 people applying, including some communities that I was really amazed to see come in the door.

Question. My question relates to the technical way in which the program is planned in your office. The bill is so written that a lot of interagency cooperation in each community is involved. Somebody has to evaluate local proposals and accept or reject them. Is there any coordinating procedure among federal agencies (e.g., the Office of Education and HUD) for reviewing these proposals?

Mr. Taylor. We looked upon this program as creating two administrative challenges. One is the challenge at the local level and the other is the challenge at the federal level. We're asking localities to look at the problem in its breadth. We feel that there's a responsibility at the federal level to respond in its breadth, and our historic programs don't permit us to act in this way. The review process at this point includes the Department of HEW, not the Office of Education, and they have set up a section within that department called the Center for Community Planning. This group has been working well with our department. We also get capability reports, which are evaluations provided by other departments. Our screening committee has on it high-level people from HEW, Labor, OEO, and Community Relations Service, who are welcome to sit in whenever they want to.

Applications that survive the initial screening are given what we call functional review, which means that they are read and analyzed in depth by all other departments. I asked these departments when we were setting up this process whether they wanted me to pull out that portion of the application that related to their special interest, and I couldn't have been more delighted with their response. Their answer was, "No, for too long we've just been looking at what relates to our interest and not to the larger picture." We are trying to develop here a pattern of involvement with those other agencies that

will sow the seed for what ultimately has to grow—a pattern of working together in the provision of technical assistance, in the refinement of funding patterns, and in the structuring of what could be a new way to meet local needs.

Question. You've given great weight to coordination among agencies, both at the local level and now at the federal level. I'm curious as to whether you assume that the increased coordination achieved among agencies, which may not have been talking together prior to this program, automatically extends benefits to the target populations that you're serving?

Mr. Taylor. No. We have asked cities submitting proposals to analyze the possible range of approaches. None of them has done the planning job. I would hate to think that the millions of dollars that the planners have spent have not been used to pursue the reality of delivering services. We didn't expect the communities to have answers in the three-and-a-half-month preplanning period. We were looking for analytic approaches and organizational capabilities. That's all we could get at this point. We'll make a selection and, if we're right, we'll hit the jackpot in a reasonable number of them. The cities will come up during the planning period with specific ways of doing things that will hopefully lead to getting appropriate services to the people.

Question. Mr. Taylor, will you review the procedure for the establishment of priorities vis-à-vis the various kinds of proposals that might be submitted? My own values are that the metropolitan approach has a great deal of promise and that, in terms of the freedoms that you might have in the allocation of scarce resources, it would be wise to look with considerable favor on these kinds of proposals.

Mr. Taylor. We said at one point that we'd give "brownie points" for this kind of effort. You can see the term "brownie point" bouncing through about four pages of the *Congressional Record* earlier this week. There is no one button that you can push in your program submission that's going to guarantee consideration. We're reading the proposals against each other in six categories and by area. We will not decide how the pie is cut until we know the quality of the universe. My guess is that competent communities that understand the problem very well will be funded. We will still have a lot of grey communities that will be funded because we have the money and we feel that, with technical assistance and encouragement, they will be able to get the job done. I am impressed with a statement that was made in the application of a Texas city, population 25,000. It described what it saw as its innovations

and then said: "These may not be innovative elsewhere in the country but they certainly are for us." Given the background of this community, that was a valid statement. This community is a long way from a takeoff point, but it's beginning. We're not necessarily looking for any one thing. The range of cities and communities to be funded, and the quality of what we've got at this point, is so wide that the ones that are good are going to make it; the ones that have a good idea and have commitment are likely to make it.

Question. I've been listening to a paradox. As I understand the philosophy behind this legislation, one of the significant needs is that local communities are incapable of making plans to surmount local problems. Therefore, the federal government, which understands the necessity for leadership, has undertaken the problem. Now we're told that in order to solve the problem, we must present to you the plan so that you may then give us the money to apply solutions. If this is the case, these things all would have been done, anyway, except for the existence of the money. Mr. Taylor, when you say that we live in a world of reality, I agree with you except that I don't see the same reality that you do. The reality is that the problem can't be solved without courageous leadership at the federal level. Now, I'm aware that those who are administering a legislative program must act within the limits of the legislation. That, however, does not mean they have to be satisfied with it and say to the cities that this is the best you can ever expect. It seems to me that the executive department has to take the lead or we are not going to accomplish the basic function and purpose of this legislation.

Mr. Taylor. The basic problems will not be solved where communities are not willing to face up to them. But to expect, sir, that we can step in and do the planning for the local community is to rest your hope on a very weak reed. I will have been in the federal service for one year next Tuesday, and it is clear to me that if you must rely upon the competence of the federal bureaucracy to get down and do the planning for your community, you're in trouble, deep trouble. We aren't that good.

Comment. I'm not saying that you should come down from Washington and plan for the community, but I think you have to give more leadership to the community in the kind of plans that are necessary to meet the broad problems. You say that we live in a world of reality and that we ought to improve schools in the ghetto. Yes, we've got to improve schools in the ghetto, but beyond that I don't follow you, because I think you're talking about something that isn't true. You're not going to succeed by improving the compe-

tency of people in the ghetto. They are merely going to join the host of the unemployed, or they are going to work below the level of their competency, because they are still in the ghetto.

Mr. Taylor. I can't really argue with you. I didn't say that this was the only thing to do. I said, at this moment in time we have a program. We will administer it as we have the power and right to administer it. I think the program is terribly important. I make no claims to its being the full or final answer. But how communities that look at themselves can say "We could never do this politically," and then ask the federal government, which after all is run by representatives of those very same communities, to do what they haven't got the courage or power to do themselves, is something that I don't understand.

Question. Am I to understand that unless local communities show leadership, you are willing, if you do get some money from Congress, to subsidize a segregated pattern? I don't see in your address here any indication of the kinds of major changes of administration that Carmichael wants when he talks about building a better segregated independent society. I think you may very well—not you personally but the administration—be feeding the Black Nationalist movement *without* the Black Nationalist's satisfaction.

Mr. Taylor. Don't say that this legislation must become the cutting edge of something that this country is not yet ready to face up to and do. Now, as communities meet relocation needs and as they move into school programs, whatever federal aids they take will be subject to Title VI of the Civil Rights Act. I would hope that communities will come in with plans that in terms of transportation, in terms of employment, in terms of relocation, in terms of the metropolitan corporations, and in other ways will have the effect of beginning to break down the barriers. However, what I'm saying here is that I can't put a label on this program and call it a dispersal program. That I will not and cannot do, and if it's lack of leadership, I'll accept that indictment. It's also lack of a death wish and the conviction that the people who are living in those hellholes deserve something now, while the country is being educated to be willing to give them what it should give them.

Question. The one big problem we must face is racism. The aspiration is democracy and equality, the reality is racism and poverty; the aspiration is dispersal, the reality is concentration; the aspiration is power, the reality is powerless. We mentioned segregation and integration. It seems to me that these are mere symptoms of this dis-

ease—racism. Integration corrects the symptom—segregation. It does nothing toward eliminating racism. The basic problem with which we must wrestle, if we are to construct a model city, is racism. I don't think the Model Cities legislation has dealt with this problem and, since it has not, I do not see how it's going to help us. Mr. Secretary, would you help me there?

Mr. Taylor. We are going to administer the hell out of this legislation. And we're going to do it right. I know that. I know the people I have. I know the backing we have. We're going to run into some really major problems. This program won't work at all unless employment opportunities are created in the process of doing what needs to be done in that neighborhood. I say that we've got people of goodwill, considerable ability, and despite the way my words have been heard this evening, great courage trying to administer and run this program. But there is no one magic elixir. The basic problem of racism that you mentioned exists in the society or we wouldn't be having the problems that we're talking about in the way of the symptoms, tonight. It does exist. It is the problem.